

Use of a Radon Stripping Algorithm for Retrospective Assessment of Air Filter Samples

----- *Operational Topic* -----

Robert B. Hayes[†]

Keywords: air monitoring, radon, algorithm, PIPS, transuranic, TRU, alpha particles, beta particles.

[†] National Security Technologies, LLC, P.O. Box 98521, MS RSL-47, Las Vegas, NV 89193,
Telephone (702) 794-8825, hayesrb@nv.doe.gov

Abstract – An evaluation of a large number of air sample filters was undertaken using a commercial alpha and beta spectroscopy system employing a passive implanted planar silicon (PIPS) detector. Samples were only measured after air flow through the filters had ceased. Use of a commercial radon stripping algorithm was implemented to discriminate anthropogenic alpha and beta activity on the filters from the radon progeny. When uncontaminated air filters were evaluated, the results showed that there was a time-dependent bias in both average estimates and measurement dispersion with the relative bias being small compared to the dispersion.

By also measuring environmental air sample filters simultaneously with electroplated alpha and beta sources, use of the radon stripping algorithm demonstrated a number of substantial unexpected deviations. Use of the current algorithm is therefore not recommended for assay applications and so use of the PIPS detector should only be utilized for gross counting without appropriate modifications to the curve fitting algorithm. As a screening method, the radon stripping algorithm might be expected to see elevated alpha and beta activities on air sample filters (not due to radon progeny) around the 200 dpm level.

Introduction

A number of technologies have been realized for rapid retrospective assessment of anthropogenic activity on air samples. These include liquid scintillation (Metzger et al. 1995), Frisch grid alpha spectrometry (Scarpitta et al., 2000), use of a commercial continuous air monitor (CAM) with flow stopped (Hayes et al., 2005) or curve fitting decay curves (Hayes and Chiou, 2003). Typically this kind of technology would be used for a rapid assessment of an air sample in the vicinity of a nuclear facility or event where a CAM is not available or practical. This could be for simple environmental air samples, routine air monitoring samples, or when an unplanned radiological release is suspected or known resulting in emergency response-type applications where large numbers of high volume air samples will need to be screened and assayed as rapidly as possible.

Experimental

This study started using 42 air samples taken over a period of a few months. These air samples were known not to contain any contamination above that already present in the environment around the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), (Arimoto et al., 2002) due to atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons. The bias and dispersion in these uncontaminated filters was then evaluated up to 10,000 minutes post sampling. Final validation attempts of the method utilized electroplated sources placed behind additional air sample filters after an appropriate radiation shield (with a matching hole in it) was placed over the source but under the air sample after the air sample filter had a concomitant hole punched in it (see Figure 1) as done previously by Hayes et al. (2005). In this way, the radon stripping algorithm could be tested with anthropogenic alpha and beta activity present in tandem with the full radon progeny distribution.

The present study was carried out using the Canberra[†] iSolo® counter which uses a PIPS detector and the standard Canberra algorithm utilized in their CAM systems. Measurements were taken at the WIPP in or near their Station A facility (Jieree et al.,

[†] Canberra Industries, Inc. 800 Research Parkway, Meriden, Connecticut 06450.

2002). Roughly half the air samples were actual Station A samples which measure the ventilation effluent coming from the underground repository. The other samples were taken from a sheltered outdoor location using a portable air sampler. Typical air flow rates were 2 cfm through 47 mm diameter air filters. As a general rule, all the Station A samples would contain varying amounts of salt dust (NaCl) where as the portable air samplers would contain common surface particulate (akin to that measured by Arimoto et al., 2002).

All air samples utilized a minimum of 3 hours of sampling time prior to measurement but many sampled for 24 hours or more. The iSolo® measurements were typically multiple sequential 5-minute counts so as to trend all time dependencies present for this assay technique.

Each day of the experiment would start with a 30-minute background count of both alpha and beta activities to correct all subsequent measurements for that day. All of the subsequent net counts generated that day were then printed out and manually entered into a database for analysis. The alpha measurements would come from the 3 to 5.5 MeV energy range of elevated counts. Air samples taken from previous days would often be measured on subsequent days as well as samples taken that day so that trends could be evaluated over long time periods. Typically, samples would be measured using the same 5-minute repeating count sequence for 24 iterations. Typically one sample would be set at the end of the day to count a similar 5-minute sequence but rather for 100 iterations (overnight).

Alpha efficiencies were measured using ^{239}Pu sources, and beta efficiencies were measured using two $^{90}\text{Sr}/^{90}\text{Y}$ sources. These values were found to be 33.48% and 12.32%, respectively (where the ^{90}Sr source efficiency was corrected for its ^{90}Y progeny solely by dividing by two).

Using the configuration shown in Figure 1 required a recalibration of the sources in that the activity seen by the detector had to be determined for each source (as the uniformity of the activity on the sources was not assured). Furthermore, the shielding used for the sources was not perfectly centered and so multiple measurements were made of each source with its shield using iterative 90° turns between each measurement. In this way, the expected values and their dispersion could be estimated and later compared with

the values calculated from actual used air filters where the radon stripping algorithm would be implemented. This process was carried out using both alpha and beta sources although the beta sources had to use much thicker shielding.

Air samples measured simultaneously with partially shielded sources were only measured for the first few hours post flow cessation. The study began in April 2005 and continued until July 2005.

Results

Air Samples Alone

The average air sample activity values are shown in Figure 2 up to 1000 minutes post flow cessation. The alpha decay rates are shown in Figure 2A and the beta decay rates are shown in Figure 2B. Along with the average values for each time interval is shown the associated one standard deviation dispersion measure as error bars. Here it can be seen that there is a time-dependent bias for the first 200 minutes. Similarly, there is also a time-dependent dispersion about the measurements. The overall trends for the alpha and beta are qualitatively similar with the primary difference being that the bias and dispersion in the beta measurements are almost 5 times that found with the alpha results.

After approximately 200 minutes, the bias and dispersion are minimized suggesting this time as an optimal delay post flow cessation for counting the uncontaminated air filters. It is of note, however, that at the one standard deviation level, virtually all measurements overlap the x-axis. It is not difficult to infer, then, that at the 95% confidence level, all the measurements from Figure 2 show that at any time all estimates of anthropogenic activity were not distinguishable from zero as would be expected for environmental air samples.

A check was made to determine if there was any statistically significant difference between the results found on the Station A air filters and those from the portable air samplers. A difference of means hypothesis test on the data given in Table 1 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in these two groups for either the alpha or beta results. This is true for both before and after the 200-minute mark.

Air Samples in Tandem with Electroplated Alpha Sources

Using the configuration shown in Figure 1, multiple measurements were typically made out to about 2 hours after flow had stopped. The results from using ^{239}Pu sources are shown in Figure 3A. Here it can be seen that the TRU activity estimated using the radon stripping algorithm systematically underestimates the expected activity values taken during the calibration of the partially shielded sources. The abscissa points show the average calibrated activity using only the shielded sources along with the dispersion in these values as horizontal error bars at the one standard deviation level. The ordinate values are the average from an approximately 2-hour sequence of multiple 5-minute counts post flow cessation of the used filters in the configuration shown in Figure 1. The vertical error bars are again at the one standard deviation level and represent the dispersion in each of the sequential 5-minute counts. A weighted least-squares fit to the data in Figure 3A was done using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm where the individual weights were the quadrature sum of the abscissa and ordinate error values. This resulted in a fitted function of $Y = m \cdot X + b$, where $m = 0.81 \pm 0.03$ and $b = -17 \pm 5$ dpm. The correlation coefficient was 0.966, although the chi-squared value was 41 indicating that the individual errors did not reflect the actual dispersion of the data around the fit. Note that for the 16 fitted points (14 degrees of freedom), the 99.5% upper confidence limit on the chi-squared distribution would only be 31.

The calculated beta activities using the ^{239}Pu sources were found to be correlated with the calculated alpha activities. The data given in Table 2 shows the calculated alpha and beta activities from each of the ^{239}Pu measurements along with the dispersion in the series of counts. Another least-squares fit using the alpha and beta errors summed in quadrature for weights resulted in a fit result to $Y = m \cdot X + b$ of $m = 0.503 \pm 0.070$ and $b = 0 \pm 9$ dpm with the correlation coefficient being 0.7 (here X is the alpha activity and Y is the beta activity). The chi-squared value was 58 indicating again that the measured errors used did not represent the data distribution in the functional fit. Some time dependence was also seen for the beta predictions but not on all samples. When this was seen, the effect was a trend toward zero in all cases, although the measurements did not extend beyond 200 minutes in these cases.

Two ^{241}Am sources were also evaluated in the same fashion as the multiple ^{239}Pu sources. These were of a much higher activity (shielded activity values of approximately 2×10^3 and 6×10^4 dpm) with both showing a calculated value of approximately 45% of the calibrated values (note that the ^{239}Pu sources averaged about 78%). Although these two data points are not consistent with the linear fit shown in Figure 3A, they do indicate an underestimate of the calculated TRU activities using the radon stripping algorithm. Likewise, the beta activity estimated for the lower and higher activity ^{241}Am sources were -15 ± 65 dpm and 2564 ± 68 dpm, respectively (the latter value could be due to the Photoelectric effect betas coming from the 59 keV gamma ray emission from the ^{241}Am). The gamma interaction may be related to the difference in the Americium and Plutonium source measurements.

The results of the linear fit to the ^{239}Pu sources in Figure 3A would suggest a 19% underestimate of the alpha activity with a negative 16 dpm bias. The empirical deviation found by taking the expected values minus the calculated values was -74 ± 63 dpm. A decision level could be formed from this result at the 95% confidence level if the actual TRU activity were $74 + 1.645 \times 63$ dpm = 178 dpm or above, then the algorithm could be expected to give a positive alpha estimate indicating the presence of TRU activity. This assumes the bias effect is constant over the range (i.e., a slope of unity in Figure 3A). Given the large deviation seen with the ^{241}Am results (45%) relative to that estimated from the ^{239}Pu results from a linear fit (19%), a quantitative decision limit does not seem reasonable although rounding up to 200 dpm for the moment seems a reasonably conservative estimate based on the data at this time.

Air Samples in Tandem with Electroplated Beta Sources

The results using the three beta sources showed very good accuracy but with fewer measurements. The results are shown in Figure 3B and show one point being overestimated by the radon stripping algorithm with the other three points showing no substantial deviation. This appears to be a reverse of the underestimates seen for the alpha calculations given in Figure 3A.

Discussion

The results of Figure 2 show that due to the dispersion in the measurements, anthropogenic activity estimations from environmental air samples post flow cessation are not distinguishable from zero. If measurements are done after the initial 200-minute window post flow cessation, no bias is expected in environmental samples at the precision measured in this study and measurement dispersion should be at a minimum. As such, one might have considered two decision levels, the first would be for measurements made within the first 200 minutes of flow cessation and the second would be anytime after this. A more accurate analysis would ascribe a time dependency to these decision levels due to the effects seen in Figure 2A and Figure 2B. Given the large bias and perturbation on the alpha results shown in Figure 3, when artificial sources are counted simultaneously with the environmental air sample filters, decision levels should be based on the latter if these could be reliably quantified. Given the unpredictable nature of the algorithm results when calculating alpha and beta activities on air filters after using the radon stripping algorithm, it is not recommended that the results obtained from this method be considered sufficiently reproducible to give a definitive number for the decision limits. As a first approximation, the results presented here indicate that the algorithm will correctly identify the presence of alpha or beta activity not arising from the radon progeny only if the former is on the order of a few hundred dpm. In principle, an alternate approach or algorithm should be implemented if radon discrimination is to be employed such as that tested and validated by Hayes et al. (2005).

No measurements were made with mixed alpha and beta electroplated sources and so the issue of mixed sources cannot be definitively addressed.

The results in this study may be attributed to the use of the radon stripping algorithm to remove counts due to radon progeny. In principle, this would be expected to be a fully valid and appropriate method; although in this case, the algorithm is the same as that used in CAMs and was initially developed for CAMs. As such, a CAM is continually placing more activity on the filter with time such that after 30 to 60 minutes, the amount of activity being deposited per unit time will be equivalent to the activity decaying per unit time. Now although these algorithms should handle the temporal disequilibria that comes

with diurnal increases and decreases in the parent radon levels (NCRP, 1998), this is not the same dynamics one would expect from completely stopping the air flow and removing any new parent source terms of activity on the filter with time. As has been shown elsewhere (Hayes 2003) for continual flow conditions with disequilibria, less dominant decay emissions can cause undesirable bias in algorithm calculations if not accounted for during changes in the parent radon concentrations. In the present case, dominant contributions from short lived radon progeny (e.g., ^{214}Po and ^{218}Po) will very quickly cease to make dominant spectral contributions which will allow bias from Thoron (^{220}Rn) and Actinon (^{219}Rn) sources to potentially become nonnegligible.

Conclusion

This study evaluated the use of a PIPS detector with a radon stripping algorithm as a viable method for screening air sample filters post flow cessation. Time-dependent bias along with time-dependent dispersion was discovered on uncontaminated filters, although the bias was small relative to the dispersion.

When superimposed source activity was present along with the radon progeny on the filter, a substantial bias is seen with an underestimate taking place on the TRU activity. This was found to also result in an overestimate of the beta activity when only superimposed alpha activity is present. These effects are attributed to the use of an algorithm designed for CAMs with constant air flow and thus constant new deposition of activity as opposed to the present use of only measuring serially decaying radionuclide chains.

Use of the evaluated technology is recommended as useful for gross counting purposes only. If sufficiently elevated alpha or beta activity is seen, independent validated sample assay techniques should be employed.

Acknowledgements

This manuscript has been authored by National Security Technologies, LLC, under Contract No. DE-AC52-06NA25946 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

The measurements and data collection portion of this work was done by Washington TRU Solutions, LLC, under Contract No. DE-AC04-01AL66444 with the U.S. Department of Energy.

Special thanks are also extended to Don Harward and Sandra Gogol for enabling this work to be done.

References

- Arimoto R, Kirchner T, Webb J, Conley M, Stewart B, Schoep D, Walthall M. 239,230Pu and inorganic substances in aerosols from the vicinity of a waste isolation pilot plant: the importance of resuspension. *Health Phys* 83:456-470; 2002.
- Hayes RB. False CAM alarms from radon fluctuations *Health Phys*. 85:S81-S84; 2003.
- Hayes RB, Chiou HC. Curve fitting air sample filter decay curves to estimate transuranic content. *Health Phys* 86:80-91: 2003.
- Hayes RB, Pena AM, Goff TE. Use of alpha spectroscopy for conducting rapid surveys of transuranic activity on air sample filters and smears. *Health Phys* 89:172-180: 2005.
- Jierree C, Frank-Supka L, Waymire G, Hayes R. Effluent and environmental monitoring challenges for an underground transuranic mixed waste disposal site. *Spectrum* 2002, 9th Biennial International Conference on Nuclear and Hazardous Waste Management, August 4-8, Reno NV, American Nuclear Society, CD-ROM; 2002.

- Metzger RL, Jessop BH, McDowell BL. Bioanalysis of Uranium, Plutonium, and Curium on breathing zone air sample by solvent extraction and PERALS spectroscopy. *Radioactivity and Radiochemistry*. 6(3);46-55: 1995.
- National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. Exposure of the Population in the United States and Canada from Natural Background Radiation. NCRP Report No. 94. Bethesda, MD; 1998.
- Scarpitta S, Carte N. Rapid Analytical Technique to Identify Alpha Emitting Isotopes in Water, Air Filters and Solid Matrices. BAER 2000, 46th Annual Conference on Bioassay, Analytical, and Environmental Radiochemistry. Seattle, Washington. November 12-17, 2000.
- Salvatore SC, Miltenberger RP, Carte N. Use of a Frisch grid ionization chamber to rapidly characterized and quantify a-emitting actinides in unprocessed soils, liquids, solids and air-dust samples. Presented at the 46th BAER Conference in Seattle, WA on 12-17 November 2000.

Table 1. Grouped statistical measures from the environmental air sample filters measured alone. All values are given in dpm. The sigma values are at the one standard deviation level.

	< 200 minutes mean	< 200 minutes sigma	> 200 minutes mean	> 200 minutes sigma
All alpha measurements	-49.97	149.94	-5.48	58.85
Station A alpha values	-158.68	125.04	-26.20	46.75
Portable alpha values	6.16	129.56	9.21	62.05
All beta measurements	-9.39	22.53	0.86	4.94
Station A beta values	-15.81	26.66	0.29	5.14
Portable beta values	-6.07	19.26	1.25	4.76

Table 2. Reconstructed activities using the experimental setup shown in Figure 1 and various ^{239}Pu sources. All values are given in dpm with the reported errors all being listed at the one standard deviation level.

Alpha activity	Alpha error	Beta activity	Beta error
-39.1	21.0	-21.2	38.2
-19.8	16.5	-23.1	23.9
38.2	12.5	-14.1	2.4
8.7	18.0	152.0	53.5
-23.0	22.2	7.5	33.3
102.7	36.4	-86.8	58.6
-30.2	19.9	-39.3	24.3
219.3	11.5	70.0	32.9
7.4	6.7	62.6	22.1
236.3	18.7	212.7	44.3
-77.2	48.7	-139.3	45.1
326.3	38.3	124.3	102.0
1.0	11.6	185.5	38.8
492.0	30.0	454.6	98.0
668.6	24.9	316.1	53.1

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Experimental configuration used for verification and validation of technique.

Drawing is qualitative only and not scaled in any direction.

Figure 2. Estimated anthropogenic alpha and beta activity on environmental air samples.

Figure 2A shows the alpha results and Figure 2B shows the beta results.

Figure 3. Comparison of algorithm calculated activity to the calibrated values. Figure

3A shows the results from the ^{239}Pu results and Figure 3B shows the results of the $^{90}\text{Sr}/^{90}\text{Y}$ results.




FIGURE 1.




FIGURE 2A




FIGURE 2B




FIGURE 3A




FIGURE 3B